



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

perhaps greatest of all in the case of women. And no one would have the heart, or the audacity, to undertake the experiment at all without a reasonable vision of the prize to be gained. It is here that incalculable service has been done by the great imaginative writers of our day who have conceived such a type of woman.

Among these George Meredith stands chief; others have contributed hints, but he has formed living figures of women who, brimful as they are of the charm of sex, learn to stand on their own ground, to think for themselves, to possess a "slender unbendingness that is their own."

F. MELIAN STAWELL.

LONDON.

---

### THE STATE ABSORBING THE FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH.

The ancient State, whether Greek, Roman, or Oriental, always included religion within itself; the triumph of Christianity was accompanied by divorce between church and State, owing to the fact that Christianity declined to be a national religion, declaring its mission to be to all men, of whatever race or allegiance, and that the State then dominant over the whole historical world was so utterly hostile to the principles of the new religion that no alliance was conceivable; the only possible relation between the two was enmity and mutual opposition.

The legalization of Christianity under Constantine was an external and political union; the church still carried on its peculiar work with its own resources and in its own way. The papal ambition for temporal power, and the interminable struggle between church and national governments mark the abnormal and transitory order of things. Moreover, from now on, owing to the example of Christianity in claiming universal allegiance, and the evident right of any true religion to claim such allegiance, no new cult could refrain from making the same pretensions; and within Christianity itself, every dogma and sect was bound to assert its exclusive right to

credence and homage. Thus was the possibility of union between the State, to which all men owed equal allegiance, and the church, within which men differed and disputed, rendered indefinitely remote. Protestantism is the great manifestation of this idea, and disestablishment—the abolition of even the shadow of union between church and State—has always been one of the conspicuous results of Protestantism.

There seems as little hope of a union between the actual church and the actual State now as at any time in history; the whole external trend of events is in the opposite direction: France is the most striking example; Spain and even Italy seem to be preparing to follow; England is showing a similar tendency in the bitter opposition to anything like church domination of the public schools. Does this mean that the actual gulf between political and religious life is deepening, and that the old synthesis of Greece and the Orient is never to return? In other words, is humanity never again to unite in one organ all the essential and universal processes of its community life? The external movements seem to point in this direction; and doubtless he would be a rash prophet who would pronounce dogmatically on a question so shrouded in perplexing and even inscrutable conditions. There seem to us, however, to be some powerful considerations on the other side, and to these we wish to call attention, and to suggest a conceivable outcome.

First, there is in the thought of the day a marked change from the former bitter and relentless strife between minds of different religious opinion; sects of Christians live in a new peace and amity; the former stress upon disagreements has almost passed away. This fact is so patent as not to need any exposition, but is so widespread and deep-rooted, and so pertinent to our present theme, that it cannot be too strongly emphasized. Moreover, Christianity has made remarkable overtures of peace to other faiths, as the Congresses of Religions and Liberal Religious Leagues, and other similar organizations testify. Missionaries go with quite another attitude to-day from that taken by the emissaries of the cross of previous generations; the leaders of the denominations advocate

building upon the foundation laid by the native cult. In the whole world of religious thought and action there is a conspicuous and remarkable *rapprochement*, as every one must perceive who watches the signs of the times. What does this mean? Is it possible that a day is approaching when the civilized world will attain practical unity in religious faith? And how would such a condition affect the relation of church and State?

Secondly, and we surmise, more significant still, the modern State has for some generations been taking upon itself functions which in all earlier periods of the Christian era were performed by the church. Four of these functions may easily be distinguished. The first is that of *education*, by all ancient thinkers considered the duty and prerogative of the State, but through all the earlier part of the Christian era assumed and later jealously vindicated by the Church. America, it is true, knows little of the control of the church in education, owing to the late origin and peculiar sources of our national life and spirit. When the Declaration of Independence was signed the rise of the modern State had already begun. The American Revolution and the founding of the new nation were deeply infected by the religious as well as the political free-thought of the French Revolution. But the authority of the church over all education is as familiar and essential in European history as it is foreign to ours. The Catholic Church still maintains the principle that dominated all medieval and early modern education, namely that all control belongs to the church; the State may, and no doubt should, contribute to the support of schools, but has no right to dictate a single point of policy or practice. Catechetical schools, cloister and cathedral schools, in all their types and variations, exemplify church control and church support; even the palace schools of medieval times, though maintained by the temporal sovereign, were planned and conducted by clericals. There is here neither space nor necessity for longer discussion of this fact: it is one of the prime differences between ancient and medieval educational systems and theories; it penetrates all the forms and methods of education, dominating

aim, instrumentalities, and results. It had its all-sufficient reason for being and is not to be denounced, but rather to be reflected upon as a significant concrete phase of the evolution of education and an instructive sign of the trend of that world movement.

The daybreak of modern life and thought saw the faint beginnings of a new idea—or rather the renewed and enriched form of the ancient idea—that education is a universal interest and hence is the duty and prerogative of the whole people as such, namely, the State. The outlines of this development are familiar to every student of education. Prussia created the first actual State system, under the leadership of Frederick William I and his successors. Perhaps the National School law (*Generallandschulreglement*) of Frederick the Great, issued in 1763, may be considered the *magna charta* of the State school system. From this time on the control and support of schools has been continuously and inevitably passing out of the hands of the church into those of the temporal power; the whole history of education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, is characterized by events which are landmarks of progress in this direction. Never before have these events been so numerous and striking as in the last half century. England has gradually shifted the weight of public education from church to State, and is now in the throes of a final completion of the task; France has driven out the congregations and even abolished religious lessons in the schools, putting in its place moral and *civic* instruction. Italy and Spain are giving unmistakable signs of following in the same path. Speaking generally, until two hundred years ago the church built and maintained schools, trained and authorized teachers, planned courses of study; to-day the State does all these things as its manifest duty and prerogative, and even asserts its right to dictate to schools supported by the church.

Public opinion has changed in the same direction: to-day the Protestant world is practically unanimous in declaring for State education, and the ranks of the Catholics, under the standard of church control, are suffering constant and increasing defections. In the very strongholds of the Catholic Church

Vol. XVII.—No. 3.

the Catholics themselves are demanding the establishment of schools both supported and controlled by the temporal power.

In the province of higher education the movement is no less marked, though naturally somewhat later in its stages. In this respect America is perhaps the most striking instance: the denominational academy and college are notoriously yielding place to the public high school, to the non-sectarian college, and finally to the State university, which is for us the ripest and most conspicuous manifestation of the general movement from religious to State control.

Still another relevant fact is that the teacher is no longer clergyman or church functionary, but layman and State officer, a change which took place so early in our own history as almost to escape notice, but which is yet incomplete in England and Germany, as well as in other European lands.

The facts here suggested in bare outline constitute one of the most important movements in the history of education since the Dark Ages, and present a transformation of mighty influence and deep significance. The process has often been accompanied by strife and passion; it has run close to the middle of the stream of intellectual evolution—in the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French Revolution, and in modern times in the renovation of nations, particularly of Germany after Jena and of France after Sedan. It figures largely in the present affairs of England, France, and Germany. As for ourselves, we may well question our complacency when we take reasonable account of two great facts: the situation and views of our Catholic fellow-citizens, and the decadent state of religious life and culture.

It seems clear, then, that the transfer of the task of education from church to State is already far advanced, and is for the present at least moving swiftly toward completion.

The State moreover has now assumed a responsibility in the advancement of knowledge, which the church has at times largely borne. But the activity of the church in this field was never very much in earnest; it lay rather in the preservation and transmission of learning than in the discovery of new truth; being indeed in some sense an accidental activity, due

to the fact that for some centuries the church was the only possible dwelling-place and refuge for men who loved knowledge for its own sake.

The second great function of the church which is passing to the State is *charity*, meaning thereby all forms of material relief for poverty and destitution. The ancient world knew practically nothing of this activity, but was wont to abandon the weak and defective of all sorts to the destruction which untrammelled nature visited upon them. Christianity ushered in a new era, and the church was the universal dispenser of aid to the needy. Most conspicuous was the charitable work of the monasteries, into whose coffers—in the days of their prime—poured a golden flood from many sources; to their doors came the weak, the sick, the impoverished, and received food, clothing, and when necessary shelter and nursing.

In more recent times the church organized and systematized its charity in the forms of hospitals, almshouses, asylums, refuges of all sorts, which were maintained by religious funds. Closely akin to this work is the great labor performed by the church for the education of the poor, which we have already implied in the foregoing discussion of education.

The church has by no means abandoned its charitable work, and the world cannot afford to have it do so; its works of relief still meet a need which no other agency satisfies. But it is long since the State began to engage in the work of charity, and the total of its activity in the field already far surpasses all the work of the church. To trace the development of the relief work of the modern State would require the expert knowledge of a student of economics and political science, and would fill many pages; but the most familiar elements of the present condition are full of significance and will serve our purpose. In place of the doles from the monastery gate we find the municipal agencies for relieving the destitute. The ecclesiastical almshouse has given place to the poorhouse or farm. It is a striking commentary on the new condition that the very police station has become one of the regular channels of State relief.

It cannot be denied that hitherto the spirit of State charity

has been very different from that of the charity of the church. The nameless horror felt by the more worthy poor at the idea of becoming dependent upon municipal relief indicates the harsh and forbidding impression too often produced by this new activity of the civil power. But this does not affect our present theme, and better days are already with us: the State is gaining tact and sympathy in its charitable work; the alliance and coöperation between civil authorities and various voluntary philanthropic bodies, especially the Associated Charities, indicates the trend of progress and will hasten the advance.

The contrast between present and past is nowhere more clearly manifested than in the care bestowed by the modern State upon the distinctly defective classes—the blind, the deaf, and the feeble-minded. What did the civil power in Greece and Rome do for these stepchildren of nature, to say nothing of those more deeply wronged by her, the insane? The grave doubts rising in the minds of thoughtful men in these days as to the wisdom and ultimate social benefit of some of the State's measures of aid and relief, does not affect the significance of the work for our discussion; it is not objective value and wisdom that concern us, but motive and aim. What the church, with its limited resources and authority, strove feebly to do for the defectives, the modern State does with abundant forces, and, we trust, with increasing wisdom and perception.

The third function of the church which is manifestly being assumed by the State is not so clearly defined as the first two, but may be denoted in general as the *defense of the weak against the strong*, whether the strong in question be the hand of the ruler or the law, or simply any unauthorized tyrannical power. The most conspicuous example of this function as discharged by the ancient church was the right of sanctuary, a bungling method indeed, as likely to shield the villain against merited punishment as to rescue persecuted innocence, yet always a protection of one who was for the moment weak against a stronger foe. It was a beneficent institution in those days of violence and uncertain legal justice, often preventing irrevocable injustice, and still oftener securing the delay without



which calm adjudication is impossible. Other manifestations of the mitigating and mediating function of the church are not lacking, which though less formal and striking than the institution of sanctuary, are no less indicative of the place the church held.

The modern State has assumed this function completely. No human being within its pale is too poor or too insignificant, nay, or too guilty, to receive from it protection of property and person. To the innocent and too often to the guilty the detention prison and the court of justice prove a more effective and far more available sanctuary than did the altar steps of the Middle Ages. The accused or suspected person is jealously guarded against violence, and is granted a speedy and impartial trial; indeed we can hardly say impartial in the case of English and American judicial procedure, for the accused has every possible advantage: the benefit of the doubt, exemption from testifying to his own hurt, the right to counsel whether he can pay for the service or not, and a right of appeal, which, to say the least, is all that could be asked. Thus has the civil power assumed and enlarged the function of the church in vindicating the weak against the oppression of the strong, even where the strong in question is the punitive authority of the State itself.

Much more might be cited here: laws regulating the hours and conditions of labor, the liability of employers, the guardianship of minors, and other similar activities. In addition to all this, we note that in a certain sense the mantle of St. Francis, beloved of the birds, has fallen upon the modern civil power, with its humane officers and numberless enactments in behalf of the sub-human creatures!

Finally, we come to what we take to be the very central function of the church—the *care of men's characters and lives*. Even here there are signs that the State is engaging in the same work. The church indeed aims largely at the future life; this the State cannot do, but must confine its attention to the life here and now; yet within this limit the State is unmistakably concerning itself with the characters and destinies of its individual members. Its *educational* activity is partly devoted

to this end; and the great interest shown in the introduction of moral instruction in State school systems indicates a movement in this regard. The modern State has also undertaken the *reformation* of criminal or otherwise defective moral natures—a work in earlier times entirely entrusted to the church. One very recent example of this—lying close to the educational field—is the juvenile court, with its renunciation of the old punitive motive and adoption of the ideal of redemption. The whole conception and method of these courts suggests the religious spirit and almost startles us with its indication of the spiritualizing of the civil power.

Closely allied to this are the new methods of treating condemned persons by the indeterminate sentence and the parole, in which again, the idea of social vengeance is superseded by that of social care and the desire to reform and re-instate.

The assumption of this function by the State is doubtless in its first stages, and naturally so, for it is far easier for the State to assume such external duties as education, charity, and the defense of the weak, than for it to gain the inspiration and sensitive tact necessary for this last task. But the enthusiasm which has greeted the juvenile court and the more humane methods of correction augurs well.

So much by way of a hasty and partial survey of functions of the church now in process of transfer to the State. A remarkable fact concerning these transferred functions is that the spirit of all of them is *love*. The State has always embodied power, and the idea of the State is defined largely by its exercise of force; the church has always embodied love, and has only falsified its own nature when it has sought to exert forcible authority. The ancient State knew nothing of love except selfish care of its own ruling members; religion, and preëminently the Christian Church, have propagated the new ideal. But when the State performs the labors of love, what can be the explanation except that the State is receiving an endowment of the spirit of love, or, to put the matter less figuratively, that men are now finding in the State an organ for the expression of the philanthropic love which they formerly expressed through the church? The fact seems un-

deniable, and is worthy of the most serious attention. The modern State is completely distinguished from the medieval and the ancient State by works of love, and therefore it necessarily must be credited with the spirit of love. It seems equally certain that the process of transformation is going rapidly forward. Consider the gulf between opinion and practice in the days of "Manchester Liberalism" and in these days in which we live—the change is nothing short of a revolution.

If the past and the present are such as our survey indicates, what of the future? If we could dare simply to extend the line of actual movement into the years to come, we might say, the State will in time become fully inspired by the motive of love, and long-suffering mankind will then for the first time rejoice under a rule both potent and benignant. To complete the dream we need only add the realization of the "federation of the world and the parliament of man." What were such a State save the realization of the yearnings of all high souls, the Kingdom of God upon earth? Such an outcome would be the justification of the process which split civil and religious functions asunder at the advent of Christianity, and showed the world such a dramatic, too often tragic, parallel existence of the two powers; for we should see that only through this process could the two elements of power and love be finally united in one body, the new church-state.

The great argument against the spiritualization of the State is the obstinate and obtrusive fact of the hardness and materialism still deep-rooted in the nature and conduct of States, most conspicuously manifested in the horrible phenomenon of war. It cannot be denied that the waging of war is a breach of the State's love for its own members as well as for the race. Over against this must be set the great movement for peace which is one of the most characteristic achievements of our own day, with its astonishing success in replacing war by arbitration, a success which has paled the hopes of its adherents and made foolish the scepticism and scorn of the reactionaries.

Of deep significance is the decay of ecclesiastical dogma and observances in all civilized lands, a fact declared most loudly by

the friends of the church. Germany, France, England, and our own country, as well as less important lands, report the same general condition. The world cannot exist without the love of which the church has been the bearer. If the decadence of the present ecclesiastical institution is to continue, then must some other form, possessing strength and proportions adequate to so great a task, take its place. What form so natural and appropriate as the State?

A sign of the trend of world thought may be seen in the spread of socialistic ideas. Socialism is nothing more than a dream of a political system endowed with all the power of the historic State and all the love of the historic church, and hence we need not wonder at the boundless enthusiasm with which men have embraced and served the socialist ideal. By the spread of socialistic ideas we do not mean simply the growth of socialist parties, a striking phenomenon in itself, but the permeation of all political and social science and thought with elements of socialism. To-day conservative and academic circles approve with untroubled hearts doctrines which would have horrified our grandfathers.

Universal education would be an essential part of the realization of such an ideal as we have suggested, not indeed such predominantly intellectual and technical schooling as now prevails in civilized lands, but a richer training, cultivating the feelings and the social will, such as the inspired teachers of all times have proclaimed. The church has been the organ through which labored the comparatively few whose hearts were touched with the fire of divine love for mankind. Should there come a time when all normal men and women will possess this birthright of the human soul—love for the race—is it not more reasonable to suppose they would exercise that love through the body politic, to which all belong by birth and dwelling than through a body they must *join*? The State is the form through which individuals express activities which all share in common; the church has always been a medium through which the few expressed an activity which marked them as peculiar and distinct.

The ideas expressed in this article are in no wise hostile

to the church as it exists, and certainly not to the church as it has existed and wrought. The church was the organ and exponent of love for centuries, while the State embodied only force and oppression of the weak by the strong. The church fed the hungry and clothed the naked and nursed the sick, when the State had nothing but contempt or neglect for them. The church built schools and provided teachers for the poor, as well as the rich, when the State had forgotten even what the ancient State knew and practiced as its educational duty. The church, as the corporate form of Christianity, has bestowed upon the modern State all that is best and finest in its spirit and activity. No changes which the future may bring can dim the brightness of these services.

The spirit that is working in the world and whose record is the history of man, never comes to destroy, but always to fulfil; not one jot or tittle of the true message and significance of the church shall pass away till all be fulfilled. But there is also a law that one form must increase and the other decrease. If the State should ever, in the course of ages or centuries, undertake all the labors of love which hitherto have been chiefly performed by the church, the Divine will not have vanished nor been diminished, but will only have clothed itself with a new and more adequate form.

EDWARD O. SISSON.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.

---

## STUDENT SELF-GOVERNMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Among many students and at many institutions of learning an unfortunate misconception of college spirit has long prevailed. Too much stress has been laid upon the outward things: some students, if their conduct be a true criterion, would apparently conceive of college spirit as consisting in the disorderly rush and a general spirit of boisterousness on public occasions, in the inconsiderate hazing of fellow-students,